

I have a copy of their statement of principles. More than 100 individuals are involved, mostly professors and other academicians and think-tank people. I do not know if there are any politicians in there. Hopefully, no politicians will be involved. But this is important. This is important because they want to get together and try to change the tone and the nature of the debate. Now, are they liberals or are they conservatives? Are they libertarians or are they constitutionalists? All of them. It is a mixture. They do not want just the liberal flavor or just the right-wing conservative flavor. It is anybody who is willing to sit down and talk about the disadvantage, the practical disadvantage of this road to empire and why we come up on the short end and that this moral obligation of us policing the world really is not a wise idea.

I want to read a little bit from their statement of principles. It says: "We are a diverse group of scholars and analysts from across the political spectrum who believe that the move toward empire must be halted immediately. The need for a change in direction is particularly urgent because imperial policies can quickly gain momentum with new interventions begetting new dangers, and thus the demand for further actions. If current trends are allowed to continue, we may well end up with an empire that most Americans, especially those whose sons and daughters are or will be sent into harm's way, don't really favor."

"The American people have not embraced the idea of the American empire, and they are unlikely to do so. Since rebelling against the British Empire, Americans have resisted the imperial impulse, guided by the founders' frequent warnings that republic and empire are incompatible. Empire is problematic because it subverts the freedoms and liberties of freedoms at home while simultaneously thwarting the will of the people abroad. An imperial strategy threatens to entangle America in an assortment of unnecessary and unrewarding wars."

"There are ominous signs that the strategy of empire has already begun to erode our fundamental rights and liberties. More and more power is being claimed by the executive branch. And on the economic front," which is important in my argument, "on the economic front, an imperial strategy threatens to weaken us as a Nation, overextending and bleeding the economy and straining our military and Federal budgets."

Further reading on from the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy: "The defenders of empire assert that the horrific acts of terrorism on September 11 demand that we assume new financial burdens to fund an expensive national security strategy, relax our commitment to individual liberty at home, and discard our respect for stated sovereignty abroad. Nothing could be further from the truth. Following 9-

11, we should have refocused our attention on the very threats facing us in the 21st century. As a nation, we must not allow the events of 9-11 to be used as a pretext for reshaping American foreign policy in a manner inconsistent with our traditions and values and contrary to our interests."

And that is basically a brief outline of the principles of the Coalition for a Realistic Foreign Policy.

We have been told by some of our leaders that standing up for good against evil is very hard work and it costs a lot of money and blood, but they have gone on to say we are willing to pay. These are the politicians. This has been true for thousands of years. The politicians are always grandiose in their goals and their schemes and their plans for what they think is best for the world, and they are always willing to pay with dollars and blood.

But the politician never pays. Politicians here on the floor who are so anxious to go, many of them have not served, and many of them would not be very anxious to be serving over there. It is the politicians who promote the wars that rarely serve. The only way that anybody on this floor should ever vote to send our troops into harm's way is they should look at it in a very personal way. They should look at it in the sense of what would it be like if I would go there and I would be carrying a rifle on the front line, or I would be a target for some sniper. Do I want to be there? Is it worth that? Or would I send my son to do that, or would I send my grandson or my granddaughter to that type of danger?

It has to be personalized. Because if it is just, oh, we are willing to pay. Where does the money come from? We are flat-out broke. We have had the biggest deficit ever. Our dollar is going down on the market, and we are now assuming more liabilities. When we spend \$87 billion in Iraq, that is literally taken out of our economy. Imagine how many jobs and how much improvement on the standard of living of Americans could occur with \$87 billion, and at the same time believe sincerely that a policy of nonintervention would be the best policy for peace and prosperity.

I do not know how anybody could reject that policy. It is fantastic. It is the policy of free people. It is not the policy of empire. It is not the policy of imperialism.

But I am going to win this argument. Not because I am persuasive. I will win this argument that we have gone too far and have overextended. Sadly, I will win this argument because we are going to go broke. Because all great nations who believe that they can spread their will around the world, they always overextend; and then it virtually always leads to the debasement of the currency.

In the old days, they deluded the metal or clipped the coins. Today, it is more sophisticated, because we run up the debt, we send it over to the Fed,

and they print the money. But that is debasing the currency, and it undermines the standard of living, already occurring with people on fixed incomes. So it will finally come to a halt, just as our intervention in Vietnam finally came to a sad halt. It did end. But the rest will come to an end when we can no longer afford it.

We should have greater faith and greater confidence in freedom. Freedom works. And that was the message of the Founders. That is the message of the Constitution. But we have lost our confidence. We have lost our way. We cannot even have one single problem exist throughout the country without coming here for another law.

I think it is time that free people gain some confidence, believing sincerely that we will all be better off, we will all be more prosperous, we will all be much freer, and we will all be much safer. And then, when we achieve that, then I believe other countries of the world will have a stronger desire to emulate us, rather than hate us.

□ 1600

#### MEETING OUR RESPONSIBILITY IN IRAQ

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MUSGRAVE). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 2003, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Madam Speaker, I opposed the President's decision to rush to war earlier this year. Many of us, at that time, warned of the high costs and difficulties of winning the peace that we face today in Iraq. But the President's poor decisions have painted our country into a difficult corner, and I believe that we now have a responsibility to provide funds and to maintain security on the ground in Iraq and to assist in the reconstruction of that country.

Let us not fool ourselves or the American people. It will not just be the tens of billions of dollars that we passed in the bill today. It will require billions more in the years ahead. We also have other responsibilities, to level with the American people and to pay for our efforts in Iraq in a straightforward and up-front manner. The President shirked the first responsibility by failing to prepare the American people for the true costs of the war and winning the peace.

Now, he seeks to escape responsibility for the second by putting those costs on our national credit card and running up huge deficits. Every penny of the \$87 billion requested by the President is money borrowed from the next generation of Americans. His out-of-sight, out-of-mind approach to such important issues will end up costing our children down the road. We should not be waging war and peace by credit card. If we are willing to pay the price to defeat the scourge of terrorism, we

must pay for it in an honest way. While the Bush administration has asked our troops and their families to make the ultimate sacrifice, the President has given the wealthiest Americans a huge tax cut. That is wrong. It is wrong to pass the buck to the next generation. It is wrong to ask the younger generation, including our troops and their children, to bear the burden alone. And it is wrong to shield the wealthiest Americans from paying their fair share.

We now face a huge responsibility gap in our government. It is the gap between those who understand that we now have a responsibility to establish stability in Iraq and help rebuild Iraq and who are prepared to pay for it the right way and up front and those who call upon the country in their rhetoric to pay any price in Iraq, but then run from responsibly paying that price. I filed an amendment in this House to fill that responsibility gap. It was an amendment to scale back the Bush tax cut for the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans to pay for the costs of the bill we passed today. Incredibly, the House leadership prohibited that amendment from even coming to a vote.

The President is asking the American people to invest billions of dollars of our money to build schools, hospitals, roads, electric grids and communications systems in Iraq when here at home our Federal, State and local governments are experiencing huge revenue shortfalls in this very difficult economy. The President's budget request of this year falls \$9 billion short of what was promised by we, the Federal Government, just a year and a half ago to meet our obligations to America's schoolchildren under the No Child Left Behind legislation. Three out of five children in this country who are eligible for Head Start cannot receive help because of lack of funds. Years ago, the Federal Government pledged to cover 40 percent of ensuring that children with disabilities receive a good education in this country. That was the right thing to do. But today we are only paying 18 percent of what was promised. The same shortfalls occur in health programs, our national transportation infrastructure, job creation initiatives and a range of other important domestic needs. We must meet our needs here at home at the same time that we meet our international responsibilities in Iraq, Afghanistan and other places around the globe. We as a Nation, as a people, have enormous resources. We can meet both our domestic needs and our international responsibilities, but we must be prepared to pay for them. If we refuse to pay now for our efforts in Iraq by reducing portions of the tax cut to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, it will make it much, much harder to make the investments that we also must make in education, health, transportation and other needs here at home.

Already this year when many of us in the Committee on Education and the

Workforce called for full funding for No Child Left Behind and for special education programs, we were told we did not have the resources because of the large tax cuts disproportionately weighted to the wealthiest. Adding this \$87 billion to the deficit will make it even more difficult to meet those pressing needs. We must pay now for the costs of our efforts in Iraq. We cannot put everything on our national credit card.

The President, I believe, has totally abdicated his leadership responsibilities in this area. Our international responsibilities now require us to pay the price of leadership. Leadership is about setting priorities. The war in Iraq was a war of choice. Regardless of what any of us may think about how that choice was made, we now have a responsibility to pay for the consequences of that choice. The President, by refusing to honestly pay for the war and its aftermath, by refusing to reverse the tax cuts on even the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, refuses to acknowledge the real costs of those choices.

There are some who argue that because the President has refused to scale back his tax cuts to pay for the war and its aftermath, those of us who believe we have a responsibility to provide security and aid in reconstruction of Iraq have no alternative but to support the President's request for \$87 billion without conditions, that we have to go along with his plan to wage war and peace by credit card. That is a false choice, and, I believe, an irresponsible position. We have an obligation as a Congress to hold the President to a higher standard of leadership. If the President believes, as I do, that we now have an obligation to provide security and help rebuild Iraq, he should have the simple courage to ask the wealthiest Americans to give up some portion of the huge tax cuts to help pay for our efforts in Iraq. The choice is not between doing nothing and doing it the President's way. We should do it the right way.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MARSHALL (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of illness.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DEFAZIO) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SKELTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. LEE, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PAUL) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. MARIO DIAZ-BALART of Florida, for 5 minutes, October 20.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, October 20, 2003, at 12:30 p.m., for morning hour debates.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4801. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c) 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

4802. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the revised Strategic Plan for the fiscal years 2003 to 2008, pursuant to the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4803. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the strategic plan for fiscal years 2003 through 2008 in compliance with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4804. A letter from the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled "Comparative Analysis of Actual Cash Collections to Revised Revenue Estimates Through the 3rd Quarter of Fiscal Year 2003"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4805. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the sixteenth report in a series on The Impact of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (CBERA), pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2704; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4806. A letter from the Chairman, United States International Trade Commission, transmitting the ninth annual report on the Andean Trade Preference Act (ATPA) entitled "Impact on U.S. Industries and Consumers and on Drug Crop Eradication and Crop Substitution," pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 3204; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BUYER:

H.R. 3330. A bill to amend title 36, United States Code, to amend the Federal charter of the United States Olympic Committee; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. CARSON of Indiana (for herself, Mr. OWENS, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs.